

4034

Social Progress



Change and Challenge in China SPENCER COXE

Church, State, and School—A Grievous Conflict

DECEMBER 1949

MCCORMICK THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY.
CHICAGO

Social Progress

DIVISION OF SOCIAL EDUCATION AND ACTION

PAUL NEWTON POLING, Secretary and Editor; MARGARET E. KUHN, Assistant Editor; CLIFFORD EARLE, Associate Secretary; FERN M. COLBORN, Assistant Secretary; and WILLIAM H. MCCONAGHY, Director, and JESSE BELMONT BARBER, Associate Director of the Institute on Racial and Cultural Relations.

CONTENTS : DECEMBER, 1949

Articles	PAGE
Dixon, New Mexico—Testing Ground for Democracy, by <i>Clifford Earle</i>	1
The Double Price of Religious Freedom, by <i>Max Lerner</i>	6
Change and Challenge in China, by <i>Spencer Coxe</i>	11
Church, State, and School—a Grievous Conflict.....	19
 Editorial Comment	
An Appeal to Faith.....	16
 Sanctuary	26
 Christian Action	28
 About Books	30

Articles represent the opinions of the authors, and not the official policy of the Division of Social Education and Action of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

Published monthly, except July and August, by the Division of Social Education and Action of the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, at 1009 Sloan Street, Crawfordsville, Indiana. Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Crawfordsville, Indiana, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editorial and Executive office, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pa.

Subscriptions, \$1.00 a year; three years for \$2.50. Single copy, 15 cents. Group rates on request. Copyright 1949 by the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

DIXON, N. M.—TESTING GROUND FOR DEMOCRACY

By REV. CLIFFORD EARLE, *Associate Secretary of the Division of Social Education and Action, Presbyterian Board of Christian Education.*

IN A pile of rubble and refuse in an abandoned public-school building in Dixon, New Mexico, curious visitors last July found a discarded religious textbook which evidently had been used in Roman Catholic instruction classes. The book was a soiled and dilapidated copy of *The Faith of Our Fathers*—430 pages and 31 chapters covering all important points of Catholic dogma and practice.

The derelict school building at the time of our visit was being used as a stable for donkeys, which were placidly grazing in the schoolyard.

The visitors included members of a social-problems class in a Presbyterian leadership school being held at the time in Santa Fe. The visit was really an on-the-spot study of the famous Dixon school case.

Our teachers and guides for the day were Mrs. Lydia Zellers and Miss Olive Bowen, members of the Dixon Presbyterian Church. They represented especially the Free Schools Committee which has resisted so valiantly the efforts of Roman Catholic leaders to control and use the public schools of Dixon

and other New Mexico communities for the dissemination of Catholic teaching and propaganda.

Dixon is a village of some 1,200 people, mostly of Spanish descent, about half of whom are Catholics, half Protestants of various persuasions. The village nestles in a valley in northern New Mexico, forty-seven miles by highway from Santa Fe. Three miles away, where the road from the village joins the main highway, stand the lovely Spanish-type buildings of Embudo Hospital, a Presbyterian mission institution with a glorious thirty-five-year record of service to the Spanish-speaking people of the district.

Trouble began eight years ago when the Catholic Church, through a "packed" local school board, assumed control of the public schools. Nuns were employed to do the teaching. At one time the teaching staff included immigrant nuns from Germany who could speak very little English and no Spanish.

The nuns had previously operated the parochial school which was turned into a public school by moving all school children from the real

public-school buildings into the parochial school and putting nuns on the county payroll, using free textbooks, busses. The county not only paid the nuns' salaries, but also all running expenses of the "public" school. The program of instruction remained unchanged, with Catholic religious teaching prominent in the curriculum.

Action

Dissatisfaction centered on the poor quality of teaching in the schools, and on the fact that religious instruction was forced upon all pupils, Protestant as well as Catholic, during school hours by nuns garbed in the habits of their vocation. The Catholic prayer of devotion, Hail Mary, was recited by all students four times a day. Bingo was played in the school during hours to raise money for the Catholic Church. Students were urged to go to confessional and were deprived of privileges if they refused; great advantages were given to pupils who memorized the Catholic catechism.

Fair-minded people of the village, Catholic as well as Protestant, sought to have the public school moved off the Church premises and, hopefully, out of Church control. They were told that the public-school buildings formerly occupied were no longer habitable. Vandalism and weather had taken care of that.

So in the summer of 1947, with funds raised by voluntary subscription, a splendid five-room school building was erected and presented to the village. The dream was a truly public school in the great American tradition, with sound education, free from sectarian influence.

When the new school was opened, the school board planned to staff it with a nun as principal and three other nuns among the teachers. Catholic control was still dominant in the school.

Protest

The free schools group of Dixon then lodged a protest with the school board of Rio Arriba County. A delegation from Dixon attended a meeting of the board in the county seat of Tierra Amarilla, seventy-five miles away. The protest was referred to the New Mexico Board of Education in Santa Fe, which held a disappointing closed hearing with only one person permitted to testify for the complaining citizens. The efforts of the board to correct the abuses in Dixon were tardy and unsatisfactory.

A survey then revealed that the Dixon situation was duplicated and sometimes exceeded in at least 28 other New Mexico communities where 145 members of Catholic orders—nuns, brothers, priests—were teaching in public schools and disseminating Catholic propaganda. More than \$450,000 was being paid

to them annually, an average salary of about \$2,500, most of it going directly to the Church. Many clear violations of laws affecting Church and State relations were recorded.

Increasingly it became clear that real remedy could be achieved only through court action. So on March 10, 1948, there was entered in the district court in Santa Fe a formal suit which demanded "the removal of nuns, brothers, and priests from public-school positions." The suit was filed in the name of 28 plaintiffs from 7 New Mexico counties. It named 235 defendants, including Governor Thomas J. Mabry, the state and county officials involved, the superintendent of Catholic parochial schools in the archdiocese of Santa Fe, and the 145 members of Catholic orders who were teaching in the "public" schools. Governor Mabry, it happens, is a member of a Presbyterian church in Albuquerque.

Trial

In the suit, the plaintiffs asked that all schools named in the complaint be declared parochial schools and ineligible to receive public funds, that all members of Catholic orders be forever barred from teaching in New Mexico public schools, that no New Mexico tax-supported school be conducted on Church-owned property, and that other abuses be corrected.

The case was tried before District

Court Judge E. Turner Hensley in Santa Fe in October, 1948. The complaining citizens were fortunate in having as their attorney able, earnest Harry L. Bigbee. The trial itself, with both sides vigorously testifying and arguing, lasted two weeks.

Judge Hensley studied the case for more than four months before announcing his decision. In the meantime former United States Solicitor General, Charles Fahy, came from Washington to plead with the court not to use "blunderbuss treatment" in barring members of Catholic orders from teaching positions in public schools.

On March 12, 1948, the court announced its verdict, which (1) banned 143 members of Catholic orders from ever again teaching in New Mexico public schools, (2) required the removal of public schools from Catholic buildings, (3) ended free bus transportation for pupils in parochial schools, (4) prohibited the issuing of free textbooks to parochial schools, (5) barred the teaching of sectarian doctrines in public schools, (6) banned the display of sectarian symbols in public-school classrooms, and (7) prohibited the payment of public tax funds to teachers in parochial schools.

After an unexplained delay of many weeks, on June 22 Judge Hensley filed his judgment and the decree became law in New Mexico.

Apparently a great victory had been won by the Protestant-led free schools group in Dixon!

Disappointment

Immediately it was evident that Catholic leaders were ready to take advantage of certain loopholes and ambiguities in Judge Hensley's decree.

The judgment put an end to the public-school careers of certain named members of Catholic orders, but New Mexico's attorney general, Joseph Martinez, ruled that the decree did not prevent other members of the same orders from taking their places. He also advised that though the Hensley decision banned the giving of free textbooks to parochial schools, it did not prohibit the Board of Education from supplying parochial school pupils with free books.

As soon as the court's verdict was filed, the Dixon school board announced the appointment of four nuns from outside the state to take the place of those named in the indictment. The situation in Dixon was not really changed at all.

Appeal

At the time of our on-the-spot study of the Dixon case last July, the leaders of the free schools group were already weighing the wisdom of appealing to a higher court for a clear-cut decision which would bar from public-school teaching in the

state all garbed members of religious orders.

If the case were carried to the United States Supreme Court, a favorable decision would apply throughout the country. The Dixon group feels that the trial record developed in the district court proceedings in Santa Fe is complete and comprehensive, and could well be the basis for the highest appeal.

On September 20, 1949, attorney Harry L. Bigbee, in behalf of the complainants, announced that the case is being appealed to the New Mexico Supreme Court and, if necessary, to the United States Supreme Court. The order permitting this step was filed by Judge Hensley. Mr. Bigbee stated: "The only ground for appeal is that my clients do not believe Judge Hensley's judgment broad enough to effectuate the doctrine of separation of Church and State."

Speaking for the plaintiffs, Mrs. Zellers said that they are asking the disqualification of all Catholic nuns and brothers, as a class, as public-school teachers. "We are asking this disqualification as a class because of the nature of their vows," she explained. "We have examined those vows and found that they require allegiance to the Church first, and then to temporal authority. It does not permit the removal of religious influence from the public-school classroom."

This all takes money, more money

by far than the Dixon group can provide. They exceeded generosity in erecting the new public-school building two years ago. The district court trial cost several thousand dollars to which they contributed to the limit of their means.

Thousands of friends of the cause they serve, however, assisted with contributions ranging from a dollar or two to one hundred dollars. The group estimates that \$10,000 will be needed for appeal to the State Supreme Court and \$15,000 will be required to carry the case through to the United States Supreme Court. They have about \$2,000 on hand at present, and depend upon their friends, new and old, across the country for assistance. Contribu-

tions are being sent to the Free Schools Committee, Box 45, Dixon.

Great souls are the people who have carried the ball in the Dixon case—Lydia Cordova Zellers, daughter of a Presbyterian missionary, whose father was once pastor of the Spanish-speaking church in Dixon; Porfirio Romero, graduate of McCormick Theological Seminary and present pastor of the church; Olive Bowen who is associated with her sister, Dr. Sarah Bowen, in Embudo Hospital; Paul Stevens, courageous Presbyterian minister in Taos, New Mexico; and many others. The work they are doing is important, not only to Dixon, but to the preservation of our precious American heritage—the free public school.

Bulldozer Attack on Illiteracy

Over half the people on this earth can neither read nor write. An illiterate citizenry is not likely to produce a stable, progressive, and productive community. The development of a world community based on democratic, representative government requires an all-out attack on the world's illiteracy.

If we could transmit what we know now in America about deep-well irrigation, crop rotation, soil care, and seed selection, we could overcome a large part of the world's food problem. In fact, some food experts state that much of the world's hunger would be eliminated if farmers in the food deficiency areas could be taught to employ practices that were used in our country a hundred years ago!

We have only just begun to learn how to tackle such education problems on a large scale. The first project in mass eradication of illiteracy is now well under way in Haiti under the direction of UNESCO. But the project very nearly failed. Interestingly enough, it was the local people who saved it. When the UNESCO staff was on the point of admitting failure, the natives drew upon the little learning they had absorbed to paint crude signs that began appearing on trees, fences, and buildings, exhorting: "Support UNESCO Hard." Today, the gratitude of these people is perhaps best indicated by the fact that at last count, nine children in one small valley had been christened UNESCO.

—Excerpts from "Bulldozers for Peace," an article appearing in the fall college edition of *Changing World*, a new semiannual publication of the Collegiate Council for the United Nations.

THE DOUBLE PRICE OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

By MAX LERNER, *lecturer and author.*

THERE is no more essential doctrine in the American tradition than the separation of Church and State. We have always recognized that this has a double meaning: the State must leave the Churches free, but the Churches must also be kept away from meddling with the State, and especially from using State funds.

Americans suffer from having too easily forgotten how strenuous and costly was the early struggle to lash down the principle of the separation of Church and State. The same year that saw the Declaration of Independence—1776—saw also the great Virginia Declaration of Rights, in which James Madison and George Mason joined to assert that religious freedom is not merely something to be tolerated, but an inherent right of the person. Ten years later, in 1786, Madison led a fight in the Virginia Assembly against a bill to

tax Virginians for the support of religious education. In his campaign against it he wrote his famous Remonstrance, which deserves to be one of the great classics of the American credo. He beat the bill, and then succeeded in getting through the Assembly Jefferson's measure banning State support of any Church. In 1789 Madison led the fight to add a Bill of Rights to the new United States Constitution, and the very first amendment in the present Bill of Rights reads as follows: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

There is a new tide rising in American thought which ignores the tradition of Madison and Jefferson, and is ready to surrender to an uncritical demand to bring the State back into religion and bring the Church back into education.

This article is from the book Actions and Passions, by Max Lerner, published by Simon and Schuster, Inc. The book is a compilation of some two hundred newspaper pieces written by Dr. Lerner between November, 1944, and August, 1948. These reveal the vital heart of the critical issues faced in those momentous years—issues that continue with us now. The author's keen, clear analysis is a welcome light especially to those who have responsibilities for leadership.—The Editors.

Back in 1925 there was an epochal Supreme Court decision, *Pierce vs. Society of Sisters*, establishing the right of the Catholics or any other religious sect to maintain their own schools (if they so wish and at their own expense) outside the public-school system. That was a weighty decision to make in a democracy founded on the community's stake in public freedom. The question now is whether freedom to run sectarian schools also involves the right to use general tax funds for that purpose.

Does the school bus issue (in the case of *Everson vs. Board of Education*) involve the first amendment, forbidding any "law respecting an establishment of religion"? I think it does, and this is also strongly the view of the dissenting opinion of the Supreme Court in the *Everson* case. (By a five-to-four vote on February 10, 1947, the Supreme Court upheld a New Jersey State law—and also similar laws in New York, Massachusetts, Louisiana, Michigan, Indiana, and Illinois—by which public tax funds can be used to pay for school busses serving parochial as well as public schools.) The purpose of all sectarian education, Justice Rutledge points out, is the propagation of a certain brand of religious belief. The means used are not only teachers and books and classrooms and school equipment, but also transportation. The transport item is, at least

in the rural areas, as essential as the teaching item. For the public to pay that out of taxes is as much a support of sectarian education as for the public to pay the teachers.

But, argues Justice Black, the support of school busses by the township or State is like the support of any other measure for the public safety or the public welfare. And the State must be neutral in conferring these benefits on children of various religious groups.

This is the heart of the majority decision, and before Justice Rutledge gets through with it he leaves it a shambles. For, as he points out, the whole purpose of the first amendment was to exclude religion and religious education from the public functions supported by the State. If it is a "public function" to provide religious schools with bus transport, then why not also, he argues, provide them with school lunches, payment for teachers, and everything else?

It will be a disaster if America yields any further to the drive for State support of religious establishments. That way lies social chaos and bigotry and tyranny. For, as Madison pointed out long ago in his *Remonstrance*, the whole point about separating Church and State is to take the question of religious education out of politics. Once it is admitted, you get a competition between various sects for State funds and State support, and, finally, for

State power. Religious controversies are fatal to democracy. The only way to avoid them is to stick to the rigid separation of Church and State, and especially of Church schools and State funds.

There is a double price, as Justice Rutledge points out, that we must pay for religious liberty. One is the immense effort to keep the State from interfering in the way a man worships his God. The other is the equally immense effort to keep the Churches from using State strength to propagate one particular version of religious truth. Let us not forget that to assure religious freedom in the first sense, we must assure it in the second also.

It is true that dangerous inroads have already been made on the principle of the separation of Church and State. The first step was taken when the Supreme Court decided that a religious group could not be compelled to send its children to the public schools, and that it could run its own schools at its own expense. Two values conflicted here: the nation's stake in having a common democratic education for its children, and the principle of freedom of conscience in education. The latter won.

This should have meant the end, but the inroads have gone on. Every State except one has now allotted "released time" for religious education at public expense. (In the next important case involving edu-

cation and the separation of Church and State—*McCollum vs. Illinois*, decided on March 8, 1948 (92 L. Ed. 451)—the court majority (including Justice Black) dealt a blow to the "released time" program when it is an integral part of the school program.) School lunch subsidies are given parochial and public schools alike. School bus transportation is being provided for both out of State and local tax funds, and in the fateful *Everson* case the Supreme Court decided it was constitutional for the States to do so.

For each of these encroachments a specific reason was somehow found for getting around the general principle. But now the issue goes to the root of the principle, for what the parochial schools (mainly Catholic, but to some extent Protestant) are demanding is that while they keep their schools wholly to themselves and run them in their own way in order to indoctrinate their children with a particular religious and political creed, they be allowed to do so at Federal expense and share in all the Federal aid benefits given to schools run by the whole community.

This demand is breath-taking. The strategy has for years been to whittle away at the principle of separation of Church and State unobtrusively, on the margins. Now with the defenders lulled and bemused and confused, the assault is directly on the citadel. Once that is taken,

the rest of the city—the city of man, of secular democratic education—will not easily be defended.

What are the arguments used? They all follow the same pattern: that the parochial schools are not asking for subsidies as schools, but are asking only that there be no discrimination against Catholic children in the use of public funds. This is an appealing argument, and one hard to resist. I detest anti-Catholicism as I detest anti-Semitism or anti-Negro racism. There is no room in a democracy for discrimination on the basis of religion or color. All must be treated equally.

Yet the argument is nonetheless thoroughly fallacious. No one is proposing that Catholic children in the public schools be treated differently from others. That would be monstrous. The real point is that the parochial schools are not part of the public-school system in a democracy. They are part of a religious establishment. A democracy goes as far as it can go in allowing them to break away from the public-school system, and withdraw their children and indoctrinate them along lines determined not by the democratic community, but by a Church. To deny public subsidies to Church schools is not to deny equality, but to insist that the granting of a special privilege need not carry in its wake the subsidizing of it.

Let me put it this way: Schools exist in a democracy in order to

develop its civic ideals, to transmit its cultural heritage, to mingle youngsters of every race and religion so that they can learn to live together. When public funds are used they are used for these purposes. Any religious group that wants to secede from the public-school system can do so—at its own expense. It can, if it wishes, transmit not the whole Western cultural heritage, but a small section of it devoted to certain “absolute truths.” It can, if it wishes, refuse to contaminate its children by contact with the community’s ideas. But if a Church makes this choice, it must stand by it. It can scarcely expect that the community will not only allow the secession to take place, but underwrite it with public money. That is not a demand for equality for the minority, but of suicide for the community itself.

In all honesty can we take any other position? The Catholic clerics accuse the Protestant leaders who oppose Federal subsidies for parochial schools as being “divisive.” That is a curious argument from a group that has insisted on its right to split off from the general school system, and has at the same time kept up a continuous attack on the “irreligion” and “moral emptiness” of that school system.

They point out also that they spend many millions for education, thus making the community’s school expenses less. True; but they spend

those millions on their own decision, for their own Church and educational purposes, not for those of the community.

Senator Aiken cites the GI Bill of Rights as proof that the separation of Church and State no longer has meaning. "The United States," he says, "is paying today to educate priests, Protestant ministers, and rabbis." True; but those are grants we make not to keep the divinity schools going but to reward the veterans: they are grants to a particular group of persons to be used educationally as they wish. The Federal aid bills are bills to prop up the school system.

I sympathize with the plight of the parochial schools. They need more money, just as every school does. Under rising costs, they find it hard to compete with the publicly supported nonsectarian schools.

They would like to shift part of the burden of cost to the community.

But if they do, it will mean that all of us are supporting the schools of a particular religious group. It would mean that we are supporting "an establishment of religion." And nothing in the Constitution is clearer or wiser than that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." The framers of the Constitution knew that once the Government begins to tax people to support a Church and its special ideas of sin and salvation and truth, it opens the door for infinite religious strife, and democratic harmony becomes impossible. The encroachments on that principle have already proved its truth. To prove it further and more deeply would invite disaster for the religious freedom of all of us—Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, agnostic.

To Meet the Hunger of the Mind

Support for programs to meet the pressing needs of other countries for technical and professional books—needs that still exist despite the shipment abroad of more than four million publications in the last few years—is urged by the U. S. National Commission for UNESCO.

Three main plans are now in operation in this country: The UNESCO-CARE book-buying program, inaugurated this year, is aimed to meet the most specific requirements for scientists, educators, teachers, and students. The U. S. Book Exchange is a medium for both gift and exchange operations. A third device, aimed to overcome currency barriers to the distribution of publications,

is the UNESCO Book Coupon Scheme.

An initial shipment of \$15,000 worth of American-donated books has recently been forwarded by CARE. The CARE book program calls for the purchase and shipment of book packages "to meet the hunger of the mind" in much the same way that CARE food packages are handled. The book packages, and a few magazine subscriptions, are consigned to institutions rather than individuals.

Donors of sums over \$10 can designate the country to be benefited, specific institutions, and category of gifts. CARE deals only with cash donations. Shipment and handling is arranged through its offices at 50 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

CHANGE AND CHALLENGE IN CHINA

By SPENCER COXE, *Associate Secretary—China, Foreign Service Section, American Friends Service Committee.*

THIS article proposes to indicate three major adjustments in Christian thought and action in China that the dominance of the Communist regime there necessitates. It is not the purpose of this article to examine Chinese Communism by the light of Christian social teaching; nor, of course, to examine Christianity in the light of Communist dicta. Still less will it attempt to answer the question of whether Christianity and Communism can live side by side in China. "Adjustment" is not the same as compromise. The claims of religion are not to be trifled with, least of all for the sake of getting on with a regime that is professedly irreligious. There may arise irreconcilable divergencies between the claims of the State and the claims of religion. (This has happened too in non-Communist countries.) In such a conflict, the duty of a Christian is clear. But current conflicts in China are often between Church organization and State. In some of these cases, the Church may be wrong. It may be said without derogation of our faith that the Church visible and its members are very often concerned with the outward symbols of power, very often jealous of each

other, very often fallible in other ways. When a conflict arises, let us examine our own practices impartially, and seek to improve them if need be. To do so is to testify to the strength of our religion. It is adjustment, not compromise.

Like every revolution, the current one in China has brought violence, uncertainty, and change. Every Chinese citizen and every Western organization concerned with China has been deeply affected. An organization with an established pattern may be forced to abandon that pattern and start life anew. This is particularly true of Christian and Western groups in China, both missionary and nonmissionary. Often the adjustments are painful, especially if they tend to be restrictive or prejudicial to a long-established privileged status. A person being restricted or being stripped of privileges by a revolution finds it hard to be objective; it is natural for him to condemn the revolution *in toto* as opposed to everything he stands for, including his religious beliefs. Such an emotional and negative response to the challenge of Communism in China is fruitless and disastrous. From an objective appraisal of the Communist movement in China,

Christians will learn a twofold lesson. First they will learn that the revolution, like all revolutions, has unleashed tremendous forces, some good and some bad. The final effect on China is unpredictable. It is not for the present generation, least of all citizens of the West, to pass judgment. The second lesson is that the Christian movement in China is weak and open to criticism. Because we do not like the critics and their ways is no reason for not learning from them. Our self-appraisal need not be based on the harsh and destructive party-line criticism of the Communists alone. We are aided by the suggestions of our Chinese fellow Christians and other Chinese people of good will. The main thesis of this article is based on what can be heard and read from the tongues and pens of our Chinese friends.

The Social Order Is Changing

Enormous changes are taking place in China's social order, and, for China, the pace of change is rapid. It is largely this fact which differentiates the present movement from previous shifts of power and justifies the use of the term "revolution." Never before has a Government in China gone to such lengths to work economic changes. The Communists have clearly defined their economic policy, and have set out to implement it, always resolutely, sometimes ruthlessly. They have thought in large terms of over-

all economic planning; for example, they plan to change the balance between rural and urban production, and are taking steps to effect this. They make fewer concessions to age-old Chinese customs; for example, their spokesmen are trying to develop loyalty to the State and to the "proletariat" at the expense of loyalty to the family. Whether these plans and changes are good or bad, they show an amazing boldness and a totally new concept of the role of government. Coupled with this new approach is the all-important fact that the Communists have successfully claimed leadership of the nation's aspirations for a better livelihood. Whether or not the Communists will achieve a better standard of living for the Chinese people is irrelevant for the moment; the fact is that the Communist Party has convinced millions upon millions of Chinese (both peasants and intellectuals) that it will lead them to greener pastures. Through its zeal, through its skillful propaganda, and to a certain extent by demonstration, the Communist Party has harnessed to its own advantage the overwhelming and irresistible yearning of the Chinese people for a better livelihood.

The Communists have also consistently championed egalitarianism. They have taken away from the rich and have given to the poor. The Communists believe that the future is on their side; they see where they

are going and they have championed popular causes that are bound to win them support. They are inspired with a zeal, a faith, and a devotion. Communist economic reforms constitute a crusade, and the participants are impelled by a moral fervor. This secular religion of egalitarianism and economic betterment, of which the Communists are the high priests, has an immense appeal to the Chinese masses. China today is ripe for a religion that stresses social action.

Where Organized Religion Has Fallen Short

Organized Christianity in China has by and large failed to do this. The Christian Church in China, and Christian individuals as such, are not noted as the invariable champions of the poor and oppressed. Despite many fine examples of social vision among Christians, the Churches have not evolved a dynamic and radical program for which there is ample Scriptural and historical justification. The Communists, in their own way, have taken the lead where Christians have failed, though Christianity existed in China long before the Communist Party did, and until recently there were more Christians than Communists. The land question is a case in point. Churches and missions are large landowners; much Church work is financed by land rents, and many missionaries have lived in large,

spacious, and valuable compounds. It is neither surprising nor regrettable that the Church properties have in some instances been a target for Communist land reform. It is probably true that motives other than serving the people enter into the Communists' desire to take land from the Churches. But the Churches, both Catholic and Protestant, have failed to use the land they hold in a way that meets the pressing physical needs of the people. The land is used to support the Church as such and its workers. Christians should realize that an attack on the Church as a landowner is not necessarily an attack on Christianity. Far too often the Church's voice, muffled by divisiveness, fails to speak a language that the common people of China can understand. Chinese friends of the Church tell us that the Church in China must take a stand on the economic issues that preoccupy everyone's thought. The Church, they say, must stress the revolutionary, social message of the gospel. It must live this gospel too, even if it means selling what it has and giving it to the poor. This perhaps is the major adjustment that organized Christianity must make if it is to have a continuing influence in China.

Attitudes and Ways of Life

The second area where adjustment is needed is in the attitude and relations of Christian workers toward China. This second area is

closely related to the first, and applies particularly to non-China Christian workers in China. Christianity is still connected in the popular mind with foreigners. Foreigners in China are generally assumed to be both Christian and rich. The mode of life of the professing foreign Christian in China has not always tended to dispel the confusion that has grown up in the Chinese mind around the connection of privilege and Christianity. The Chinese are wont to judge the meaning of Christianity by the way of life of the foreign Christian, and, in general, his life does not denote sacrifice. They cannot appreciate the real sacrifices that a missionary may undergo in leaving his home and comfortable surroundings, because they have never left home themselves. They may not realize that a foreigner has to take special precautions for the sake of his health. The Chinese can only compare the missionary's life to their own, in which crushing poverty prevails. Foreigners (including Christian workers) generally live in relatively spacious and well-appointed houses equipped with gadgets. They have servants; they ride first or second class on the railways. They are clearly a privileged class. In the old days, no obloquy attached to wealth in China; quite the reverse. There seemed no reason why missionaries should adopt voluntary poverty when there were so many other dif-

ficult adjustments for them to make. Now, however, the Communists have proclaimed that a sharing of the good things of the world is a moral virtue, and have thus thrown a challenge to the Christian workers whose religion proclaims the same.

Beyond a willingness to live on a scale more clearly Chinese, foreign Christian workers must also adjust psychologically to a new mental climate. The old hierarchy of prestige and privilege is being rapidly and ineluctably swept away. The foreign Christian must reveal through his attitudes and behavior a belief in the essential dignity of every human being. Foreign Christians, like other privileged groups, have tended to accept the formerly prevailing customs. For example, soon after the author arrived in China he was taken to task by a missionary for allowing a servant to sit down in his presence. The Communists are engaged in a leveling process, whereby generals and enlisted men are indistinguishable, whereby rickshas and sedan chairs are being discouraged, whereby university students are encouraged to dig in the earth and to get their hands dirty on auto engines. It may be that another hierarchy is being instituted by the Communists, but that is beside the point. Christians by word and deed must be in the forefront of any move that stresses the equality of all men before God.

Foreigners as such were a privi-

leged class in the old days. Besides the fact that their money bought special consideration, they were, by and large, sincerely honored and welcomed, for the Chinese were quick to admit they could learn from the West. Until the current revolution, "foreign face" counted for a great deal, and the temptation to use it was very hard to resist, especially for a good end. Now all is changed. Foreigners in China are treated with no more and sometimes less consideration than Chinese. In other words, they are treated about the way Chinese visitors or residents have sometimes been treated in the United States. The days of special privilege in practice as well as theory are over for the foreigner. Nationalism in China is in an aggressive phase, and Christian workers must resign themselves to finding their nationality a disadvantage, psychologically and practically.

A Christian Foreign Policy

It has been the contention of this article that Christians in China have run afoul of the Communists in the field of social action and attitudes not because they are Christians, but because their Christianity has been overgrown with conservatism and a vested interest in the established order, and here too we have our own frailty to blame as much as Communist unreason and intransigence.





This is because Christians have failed to distinguish between patri-

otic sentiment and Christian duty. Sensitive and honest Christians concerned with China will constantly judge their country's foreign policy by Christian standards that transcend patriotism. "My country, right or wrong" is an immoral, and unchristian, doctrine.



It is not profitable at this late hour to dwell on our country's mistakes; the important fact is that by our deeds as a nation and as individuals we have not won the respect of China in recent years. Our intervention in China's civil war, our preoccupation with American strategic interests rather than with the welfare of the Chinese people, have confirmed rather than denied the Communists' allegations. Many Chinese peasants living in isolated villages have had no contact with America other than being bombed by American planes. Unfortunately, both Catholic and Protestant Churches have become implicated through the utterances of their spokesmen. Christian leaders in America, by speaking in the dual role of churchmen and apologists for American intervention, have done incalculable damage to the cause of Christianity, and, incidentally, no good to their country.

All Americans, and especially Christians, interested in China, must now face some painful but salutary facts about the Chinese attitude toward America. First, as has already been pointed out, the days of



(Continued on page 18)





An App



THE biggest item on America's "shopping list" this Christmas Day and every day of the year is "Guns—\$17,998,493,895 per annum." The armaments will, of course, not be among the children's presents beneath the tree! The heavy purchase of guns will be evident at Christmas only by the growing shortage this year, and the next and the next, of certain items made of critical metals—wagons, sleds, bicycles—toys that make glad the heart of a child. There is no comfort in speculating on the grim meaning of the shortage and high price of toys at Christmas. Must these things be? And will the children for whom we could not afford the carriages and skates and dump trucks and chemical sets have their "chance" when they drive the weapon carriers and ride the machines that fly faster than sound to death? Let us pray and labor that these things shall not come to pass!



The hard facts of economic life make it clear that not even America is rich enough to provide both guns and toys. To meet the demands of a \$17,998,493,895 arms budget for weapons and material requires the labor of 7 million men out of our labor force of approximately 60 million men. Every year we devote 7 million years of life to preparation for war. By this budget for armaments enormous quantities of critical matériel and labor are diverted from economic goods to a \$17,998,493,895 economic waste heap. (This does not allow for the few hundreds of millions of dollars in the military budget that do provide economic goods and services, such as roads, dams, etc.) Into this economic waste heap we have thrown billions of dollars of wealth that could provide goods other than toys. Included are hospitals, schools, churches, decent homes that could eliminate slums, the means for the conservation and reclamation of our natural resources, adequate health and social services.



Curiously, we accept an exhausting armaments drain on our economy while we greatly resist expenditures for housing and health for the poor, in the fear that such expenditures will fasten upon us the dominion of an all-powerful state. The Federal Government bill for all welfare services is less than \$3,000,000,000. We "strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel."

to Faith

A CHRISTMAS GIFT TO CHINA

ONE item in the arms budget has fascinating possibilities, especially so at Christmas time. The \$75 million included as aid for China in the MAP budget presents us with perhaps an unforeseen opportunity. Congressman Walter Judd and the other Congressional leaders insisted on the inclusion of this item as the price of their support for the bill providing military aid for Europe under the Atlantic Pact. Perhaps this provision makes possible gifts from America to China that are in harmony with the Christmas spirit. Let us concede that the \$75 million was urged by its advocates for military aid to the Nationalist Government and General Chiang Kai-shek. The bill as passed provides that aid need not be limited to military expenditures, and further provides that the amount shall be spent at the President's discretion. The way is clear if our President would take it for us. We could send the people of China a gift in vehicles of peace—wagons, trucks, locomotives, medicines, rails, food, clothes, etc. We could send "plows" instead of "spears." Our armaments for the Nationalists have fallen into the hands of Communists. But in the hands of either Communists or Nationalists, they have brought death to the Chinese. When these new supplies come into the hands of the Chinese, the testimony, "Made in America," on a "plow" will be the same as it is in the hands of Communists—that America builds for peace and produces life for the people of China. (It is interesting to imagine the effect on a Communist should an American plow fall into his hands. He could hardly destroy his neighbor with it. Perhaps he would plow with it.)

\$75 million for the people of China is not a great amount, but it may well mark the turning of a tide and bring benefits beyond our imagining. It is the kind of gift to honor the birth of the Child of Peace. It will be a "sign" unto us and to all people that the resources of America are to become a swelling tide moving the nations from wars and the rumors of war to the things that belong to peace.

It is time now to write the President, encouraging such a gift at Christmas.

—Paul Newton Poling.

Change and Challenge in China

(Continued from page 15)

foreign prestige and face are over. This is particularly true as regards the United States. Secondly, neither the Communist Party nor the Chinese people as a whole are convinced that America has much to teach them in the way of economics and social organization. America is admired for its material achievements, and that is about all. Thirdly, China is not going to allow itself to be made a puppet by the United States. China will someday be friendly to the United States and will co-operate with us, but it will be of its own free will; we cannot force China into our orbit, nor can we buy its good will with relief. In 1947, hungry college students and professors in Peiping scorned a free allowance of U. S. Government rice because they disapproved of our country's intervention in the civil war.

Christians in China and America should accept these facts with humility, and make sure that in the future they advocate a Christian foreign policy resting on the following:

1. This country must bear in mind that the situation in China is

beyond our control. Vast forces are at work, and their ultimate outcome cannot and should not be determined by us.

2. America should realize that it can no longer use China as a pawn in international power politics. Our policy in China must have regard first and foremost for the welfare of the Chinese people. Continuation of civil strife under no circumstances benefits the Chinese people. America should resolutely refuse to intervene.
3. America should in word and deed encourage land reform, improvement of living standards, and other needed economic changes, rather than oppose them simply because they are part of the Communist program. We should welcome the good that is coming out of the Communist revolution and seek out areas of agreement and co-operation. On taking a stand against the evils, we should practice forbearance and understanding, in the faith that kindness and good examples are ultimately more powerful than denunciation.

Present a Christmas gift subscription of SOCIAL PROGRESS to—

- your church library
- your women's society or men's club
- your neighbor whom you'd like to influence for the Kingdom.

\$1.00 a year, \$2.50 for 3 years

CHURCH, STATE, AND SCHOOL— A GRIEVOUS CONFLICT

Controversy over the question of Federal aid to education is still seething in American community life, although it is no longer headlined in the nation's news. And the basic problem of strengthening our American public schools still remains an item of unfinished business on our democracy's agenda.

Last September when debate over proposed Federal legislation had reached fever heat the Department of Research and Education of the Federal Council of Churches attempted to restate and clarify the issues involved in Information Service of September 10, 1949. The following excerpts from this publication present the Roman Catholic and Protestant viewpoints.

How Roman Catholics See the Matter

The Roman Catholic Church in America believes that its schools are morally entitled to receive aid from public funds just as denominational schools do in England, for example, since these schools are a part of the nation's educational system. They are defended as "semipublic" since they carry on, in addition to religious instruction, a program of general education specified by public authority, and accepted as fulfilling a public requirement. Since the Supreme Court's decision in the *Pierce* case (1925), which invalidated an Oregon statute requiring all children to attend public schools, the Catholic parochial schools are legally recognized through the operation of compulsory school laws. Catholics insist that failure to ac-

knowledge this status is to make education a public monopoly.

Archbishop John T. McNicholas, chairman of the Administrative Board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, has put it this way: "Poor parents, who, for conscientious reasons—as they interpret their motives before God—cannot make use of tax-supported schools where there is no religious teaching, even outside school hours, and no spiritual discipline, should not, in justice, be deprived of our American freedom of education. . . . If, under our freedom of education, parents are too poor to send their children to the schools of their conscientious choice, the Government should study their problem with them and come to their aid."

Spokesmen for the Catholics make much of the fact that if their parochial schools were to be aban-

done the American public would have to shoulder an additional annual financial burden estimated at nearly one half billion dollars. Catholic elementary and secondary schools enroll close to 2,800,000 pupils.

Furthermore, Roman Catholics are thoroughly indoctrinated with the principle that education is a unitary process and that secular education and religious education cannot be divorced without harm to both. Thus they consider that Catholic parents' choice of a parochial school is not, as in the case of a secular private school, a free election dependent upon the parents' personal taste and financial status, but a matter of conscience. Canon 1374 reads: "Catholic children must not attend non-Catholic, neutral, or mixed schools, that is, such as are also open to non-Catholics. It is for the local Ordinary (Bishop) alone to decide, according to the instructions of the Apostolic See in what circumstances and with what precautions attendance at such schools may be tolerated, without danger or perversion to the pupils."

However, the Roman Catholic Church is finding it increasingly difficult to provide parochial schools for its children. About half of the children of elementary school age are in public schools. This gives the Catholic Church a great *de facto* interest, so to say, in the public schools even if it condemns their

secularism and shuns them on principle.

Catholic educators feel especially affronted when it is proposed, as in the Barden bill, to count Catholic children in when determining how much a State is to get, and counting them out in the distribution.

This, in brief summary, is the general Catholic position with reference to public aid to parochial schools. Catholics would, of course, agree that whatever is done for their schools should be done for all other religious schools.

We must distinguish now, however, between long-range policy and immediate strategy. Roman Catholic leaders have recognized that there is no prospect in the foreseeable future of their philosophy being accepted with reference to public aid to nonpublic schools. Recent decisions of the Supreme Court have changed the entire picture. Catholics have latterly concentrated their efforts therefore on securing aid in the form of nonreligious textbooks, free bus transportation to and from school, and such other services as may be determined upon as a matter of public policy.

The National School Lunch Act passed in 1946 is a very important factor in Catholic strategy. This measure, which was enacted not as an education law but by way of implementing a social policy with respect to surplus food distribution, and which is administered by the

Department of Agriculture, makes no distinction between children in public schools and those in non-public schools. The crucial point about the National School Lunch Act, however, from the Catholic point of view, is that Federal funds may be furnished directly, and independently of the State school administrators in the states (now numbering 27) which do not make provision for school lunches for nonpublic school children.

Roman Catholics would like to have this principle adopted in Federal aid to education so that the parochial school children will stand on an equal footing with public-school children so far as Federal funds for social services, textbooks, bus transportation are concerned. The principle is embodied in the Fogarty Bill, H.R. 1570.

How Protestant Groups See It

Although one cannot say that there is a single Protestant position, Protestant opinion tends to follow a general pattern. Before attempting to present it, we should note that there is a widespread feeling among Protestants that Roman Catholic lay opinion is not in line with official Catholic pronouncements, and that very large numbers of Catholics regret, or even resent, the declarations of ecclesiastical authorities in the present controversy. Protestants hold that democracy is relevant to the Church as well as to other insti-

tutions. They think that if the Roman Catholic laity were settling the school issue there would be less conflict over it. Thus, much of what passes for a general anti-Catholic feeling is, in intention, directed against ecclesiastical authorities.

In general, Protestant opinion concerning Federal aid to education has three aspects:

1. Current utterances by spokesmen for Protestant interests stress very strongly the principle of separation of Church and State which they maintain is assailed by the Roman Catholic Church. The Catholic Church "insists on being a State as well as a Church."

Protestants are able to cite the words of the Supreme Court in both the *Everson* (bus transportation) case and the *McCullum* (released time) case to the effect that the State cannot "aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another." The crucial point here is in the middle phrase, "aid all religions." Since this is the last word of the Supreme Court in interpreting the meaning of the first amendment, Protestants are able to use it effectively against the main Roman Catholic position which calls for impartial assistance to all standard elementary and secondary schools regardless of auspices.

When we come to the question of the "services," Protestant opinion is divided and it is not possible to state what the preponderant opinion is.

It is quite evident that large numbers of Protestants have seized eagerly upon the words of the Supreme Court quoted above but disapprove heartily the actual decision in the Everson case, upholding free bus transportation, just as official Protestantism has disapproved the decision in the McCollum case, upsetting "released time" plans. The crux of the matter is, of course, the relation between direct and indirect, or incidental aid. Large numbers of Protestants point out that free "services" are of material help to the Roman Catholic schools because they increase their appeal. The ardent support of these measures by the Catholic Church bears testimony to this fact.

Many Protestants, no one knows how many, would make a distinction between direct and indirect aid, holding that the latter, when incidental to services provided for the child, is perfectly proper. To others the thought is intolerable that their taxes are being used to further in any degree doctrines they reject.

It should be noted here that Protestant support for the passage of the Senate bill S.246 has been given with reservations. It seems safe to say that its provision that Federal funds may be used by the States for the several types of services which individual States may provide to parochial schools from public funds is displeasing to most Protestants, who regard such usage

of public monies as a breach in the "wall of separation." Nevertheless, substantial Protestant support has been given to the measure on the theory that the Federal Government should not impose its own educational policy upon the States.

2. Because the Roman Catholic Church is authoritarian and holds that there is no ultimate religious liberty to deny the truth as declared by the one true Church, many Protestants have long feared that to the extent to which the Catholic Church becomes influential in matters of government it will attempt to curtail the freedom of non-Catholics. They are able to cite documentary sources in support of this apprehension, and some startling examples of repression in predominantly Catholic countries.

In the leading article in the *American Mercury* for September, 1949, entitled "Protestant Concern Over Catholicism," Dr. Walter Russell Bowie forcefully marshals Protestant arguments. Among other complaints that he registers against the Roman Catholic Church are the establishment in countries where it is sufficiently strong of control over education and "regulations about morality generally" for the whole population; specifically in this connection, the Lateran Treaty of 1929 in which the Roman Church was given full control over education in Italy; the amazing document published in *La Civiltà Cattolica* in

April, 1948 (which was so repressive in tone that Father George H. Dunne, S. J., writing in *America* has repudiated it); repressive measures adopted in Spain and Argentina; and the much-publicized school dispute in North College Hill, Cincinnati.

There is reason to believe that "services" to Catholic children would not be so hotly contested if Protestants did not fear that such services would help to increase Roman Catholic strength, and thereby threaten American religious liberty.

3. The third aspect of the Protestant position, the traditional exaltation of the public school, offers no little difficulty to some Protestants. In recent years Protestant concern has been manifest over the high degree of secularization in public education (the word "secularization" here denoting not secular control, which is not the subject of argument, but exclusion of religious subject matter from the school curriculum). It is probably safe to say, therefore, that enthusiastic support of the public-school system by Protestants is due less to any well-thought-out theory of general education than to the desire to see maintained a vigorous public education program, entirely free from ecclesiastical control. Also, Protestants recognize the influence, actual and potential, of the public schools for preventing cultural fragmentation

and building democracy.

On the other hand Protestant parochial schools have been increasing rapidly of late. Concern over the secularist trend has become very articulate recently. A committee of the American Council on Education analyzed this situation at length in 1947. *The Christian Century* and *Christianity and Crisis* have laid much stress upon it. The new chaplain of Columbia University, Dr. James A. Pike, in his first sermon on August 7, addressed himself to this theme. He was quoted in the press as saying, "We would better understand the position of our Roman Catholic brethren if we understood what they see: that if you teach no religion, you teach a kind of religion; which is secularism."

How Secularists See It

The first thing that impresses one in the study of non-Catholic opinion on this hotly debated issue is the similarity between official Protestant pronouncements and the typical secularist position. A survey of the literature on the subject will disclose how difficult it is when reading criticisms of the Roman Catholic position to know whether the writer is a Protestant or a secularist who has no interest in traditional or organized religion at all.

This is not to say that Protestants and secularists may not both be right on a given issue. It is, however, a significant fact, not to be

passed over lightly, that a Protestant-secularist strategic alliance exists not by design but by reason of historical developments—in particular, a common concern for democracy. An example, in the present situation, is the active co-operation of “The Humanist” in the Protestant campaign. No question of propriety is raised here; the point is rather that this kind of alliance influences Roman Catholic opinion to a marked degree.

There is little to say about a distinctive secularist position, but what there is to say is important. Whereas the Protestant position has an institutional aspect and a positive religious content, the secularist position on freedom of religion seems to be that its chief value is in freedom from religion in all its institutional and traditional forms. This is a crucial point because recent opinions of the Supreme Court, although widely acclaimed in some Protestant circles, are being taken in influential secular circles as implying that separation of Church and State really means that religion is a private affair and not relevant to the conduct of government.

Again, the secularist defense of the public school goes beyond the Protestant concern for adequate, free, democratic schools. Implicitly, and sometimes explicitly, it involves the desire and purpose to make secular education the whole of edu-

cation and to make the school a substitute for the Church.

A well-known and influential columnist has declared concerning “inroads” upon the separation principle: “The first step was taken when the Supreme Court decided that a religious group could not be compelled to send its children to the public schools, and that it could run its own school at its own expense.”

A movement has just been launched in Massachusetts for an amendment to the Federal Constitution prohibiting all “sectarian appropriations,” defined in such a way as to obliterate the Supreme Court’s distinction between institution and child.

These indications of the stiffening of State controls bring to mind *The Christian Century’s* insistence that secularism is the big thing to watch in the current scene.

The Nub of the Matter

The nub of the whole matter clearly seems to be fear on the part of non-Catholics of the political power and purposes of the Roman Catholic Church. Again and again, opponents of Catholic pleas for public aid with their educational program reveal a sensitiveness to the claims of Catholic children as children to services extended to others, but they regard an unyielding attitude as the lesser of two evils.

Protestants and other non-

Catholics are inevitably incensed over intemperate charges of bigotry that have been hurled against them. Roman Catholic spokesmen sometimes seem to have a persecution complex. On the other hand Catholics might take Protestant arguments more to heart if Protestant concern were as great over Protestant ministers teaching in public schools, of whom there are a considerable number in Negro schools, as over Catholic sisters in public schools. It is well known that many Protestant educational and welfare institutions have shared in some measure in the distribution of public funds. But all such facts and considerations are eclipsed by fear of the Roman Catholic Church, which has historically claimed, and today claims in other parts of the world, the right to use the civil arm to uphold its claim to unique spiritual status.

And What Are the Next Steps for Protestants?

If the foregoing analysis is correct, the question arises whether the current method of settling the dispute by head-on conflict is the only one. Christians have often found themselves involved in a fight to the finish. On the other hand, account may be taken of a re-examination now being made by Catholic scholars of the Roman Catholic Church's teaching concerning Church and State. The editor of

Information Service once asked the late Msgr. John A. Ryan why a Catholic could not convincingly, by reference to authoritative documents, disprove the charge that a Roman Catholic President would mean "the pope in the White House." (It will be recalled that Msgr. Ryan's writing on the subject has caused much consternation among Protestants.) He replied that it was because the Catholic doctrine of Church and State had never been formulated as relevant to a non-Catholic state.

Now, however, a piece of fundamental work in Roman Catholic theology is going on, looking toward a restatement of Catholic political principles in the light of, and compatibly with, the movement of history, and in particular with the emergence of modern democracy.

And today there is urgent need for patient and thorough study by Protestants of the history, doctrines, policy, and action programs of the Roman Catholic Church. The Department of Research and Education of the Federal Council of Churches has done in this field what its limited resources would allow. The Joint Committee on Religious Liberty and a voluntary group of churchmen have gathered much information, but in proportion to the size of the task, Protestantism has not as yet made adequate provision for carrying it through.

Sanctuary

God and the State

Call to Worship:

"Thus saith the Lord, Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches: but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord which exercise loving-kindness, judgment, and righteousness, in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith the Lord."

Hymn: "Not Alone for Mighty Empire."

Scripture: Deut. 4: 1-8, 23-29; Matt. 22: 15-22; Acts 4: 13-21.

Prayer:

"O God, who by Thy providence didst lead our forefathers to this good land wherein they found liberty and freedom to worship Thee: We beseech Thee ever to guide our nation in the way of Thy truth and peace, so that we may never fail in the blessing which Thou hast promised to that people whose God is the Lord. . . .

"We beseech Thee, O God, to forgive those national sins which do so easily beset us: our wanton waste of the wealth of soil and sea; our desecration of natural beauty; our heedlessness of those who come after us, if only we be served; our love of money, our contempt for small things and our worship of big things; our neglect of backward peoples; our complacency; and our pride of life. For these wrongs done to our land and our heritage, as for right things left undone, forgive us, O Lord. . . .

"O Thou who art the Light of the minds that know Thee, the Life of the souls that love Thee, and the Strength of the wills that serve Thee: Help us so to know Thee that we may truly love Thee, so to love Thee that we may fully serve Thee, whom to serve is perfect freedom; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

—*The Book of Common Worship*, 1946.

Meditation:

In the middle of the nineteenth century a Frenchman named Alexis de Tocqueville came to America. After long and careful observation of our culture he wrote: "I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her fertile fields and boundless forests; it was not there. I sought for it in her free schools and her institutions of learning; it was not there. I sought it in her matchless constitution and democratic congress; it was not there. Not until I went to the churches of America and found them aflame with righteousness did I understand the greatness and the genius of America. America is great because America is good. When America ceases to be good America will cease to be great." What would de Tocqueville's estimate be in the middle of the twentieth century? Is the greatness and genius of America still to be found in its churches? Are its churches aflame for righteousness? Is the greatness

of America in this present hour deceptive? Is its greatness dependent upon military power and economic might, rather than upon its spiritual discernments and moral persuasions? "When America ceases to be good America will cease to be great." That is more than the testimony of one man; that is the only conclusion which history allows. If ever a nation was called of God to be an instrument for righteousness and peace, surely America is called now. But America cannot and will not be that instrument by rattling its sabers or by practicing political expediency or by failing to remember, honor, and serve the Lord its God. If Moses had been speaking in the Congress of the United States instead of to the Children of Israel, he could not have spoken more truly to America in this hour: "Beware that thou forget not the Lord thy God in not keeping his commandments, and his judgments and his statutes, which I command thee this day; lest when thou hast eaten and art full, and hast built goodly houses and dwelt therein; and when thy herds and thy flocks multiply, and thy silver and thy gold is multiplied and all that thou hast is multiplied; then thine heart be lifted up, and thou forget the Lord thy God. . . . And it shall be, if thou do at all forget the Lord thy God, and walk after other gods, and serve them and worship them, I testify against you this day that ye shall surely perish." May the same God grant that America will have the wisdom to appreciate its heritage, the knowledge to know its opportunity, the vision to see its destiny under God.

Poem: God Send Us Men Whose Aim 'Twill Be

"God send us men whose aim 'twill be,
Not to defend some ancient creed,
But to live out the laws of Christ
In every thought and word and deed.

"God send us men alert and quick
His lofty precepts to translate,
Until the laws of Christ become
The laws and habits of the state.

"God send us men of steadfast will,
Patient, courageous, strong, and true;
With vision clear and mind equipped,
His will to learn, His work to do.

"God send us men with hearts ablaze,
All truth to love, all wrong to hate;
These are the patriots nations need,
These are the bulwarks of the state.

—*Frederick J. Gillman.*

Hymn: "O God of Earth and Altar."

Benediction.

—*Prepared by George Thomas Peters, D. D., Pastor, the First Presbyterian Church in Germantown, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.*

CHRISTIAN *Action*

Church and Economic Life Week

January 15-21, 1950

Purpose and Program

God has a purpose for all of life. His will, which is to be "done on earth as it is in heaven," includes what men do as producers and consumers. This purpose calls for a response in understanding and in practice by

Nations, which make up the world's economic life;

Communities, where economic activity takes place in shop and factory, in farm and store, in office and home;

Economic Groups—business and laborer, investors and consumers, agriculture and professional—through whose co-operation economic life takes form and makes progress;

Each Individual, who, in his capacity as seller or buyer, as employer or employee, participates in and affects the character of economic relationships and activities.

The week beginning with the third Sunday of each January has been designated by the Executive Committee of the Federal Council of Churches as Church and Economic Life Week. The churches are called upon to emphasize the responsibility which the Christian faith lays upon Christians for building Christian principles into their economic relations and decisions. This year's observance is but one month before the National Study Conference on the Church and Economic Life in Detroit, February 16-19, 1950. The significance of this relation is recognized

in the special program suggested below.

Many churches and communities will participate in Church and Economic Life Week for the first time, as this is its second Church-wide observance. Others will build upon what they started last year when it was first launched.

Church and Economic Life Week in its program centers upon action in and through the local churches, in separate and joint undertakings. The purpose of this program is to enlist individuals as members of economic groups, as neighbors in communities, and as citizens of the nation in bringing economic policies and practices more in keeping with the purpose which God has revealed in Christ for economic life.

What We Can Do In the Family

- Evaluate our attitudes toward those in economic groups or on income levels other than our own.

- Discuss the goals, standards, and motives that we should apply in our choice of an occupation and in our present job.

- Use meditations and prayers in connection with family worship that relate to the responsibility of Christians in economic life.

- Become informed about an economic situation in the community which is working a hardship on people, such as housing, un- or under-employment, or discrimination, and plan to do something about it as a Christian family.

In the Local Church

- Study and appraisal by the official board of the economic practices of the church itself in respect to employment, investments, or use of material resources.

- A service of worship with appropriate sermon on a great Biblical theme such as Ps. 24:1; Matt. 6:10; Matt. 6:11; Matt. 6:24; Matt. 19:19; or Matt. 25:40.

- A daily visit by the pastor with at least one layman to discuss the responsibilities and problems of Christians in the economic crisis of today.

- A forum or symposium at a regular or special meeting of adult groups with speakers from agriculture, business, consumers, and labor.

- A book review, together with an exhibit of relevant books and pamphlets.

In the Community

- A one-day institute or week-end conference under the sponsorship of the Council of Churches attended by church leaders, particularly laymen, to discuss issues related to economic well-being and co-operation.

- Encouragement and assistance through laymen, who themselves are members of these groups, in planning programs on the contribution of religion to economic life in service clubs, civic bodies, and economic organizations.

- Encouragement and assistance of local broadcasting stations in providing special radio programs and of newspapers for editorial and other features, in keeping with the theme of Church and Economic Life Week.

- Special conferences, preferably in co-operation with other religious and civic groups, related to some community need, such as housing or job layoffs.

In Relation to the National Study Conference

Only a month separates Church and Economic Life Week and the National Study Conference on the Church and Economic Life, February 16-19, 1950. Both of these show the churches facing into their responsibility for economic life: the first, Church-wide in its observance, focused upon the local church and the local community; the second, a small gathering of four hundred delegated church leaders, designed to provide leadership on a national scale to the churches.

The conference in Detroit in 1950 will be broadly patterned after the one in Pittsburgh in 1947; it is convened by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America; its delegates are appointed by the denominations, together with councils of churches and allied religious bodies; emphasis is placed on a large majority of the delegates being laymen who are active in economic groups.

Provocative New Film

Prejudice, the newest production of the Protestant Film Commission, had its world *première* in Philadelphia on October 17 in the First Presbyterian Church. This stirring film, now available for showing in churches and church schools, probes the dark roots of prejudice and what it does to the person who practices it. Through the story moves the impressive figure of Joe Hanson's minister, a man who never preaches at him but tries to find the sources of Joe's hostility and resentment, and to show him Christ's way of love.

The film is bound to provoke comment and discussion; excellent for group study.

Available (16 mm.; sound; 60 min.) from The Religious Film Association, Inc., 35 West 45th Street, New York 19, New York; 206 S. Michigan Avenue, Chicago 3, Illinois; 351 Turk Street, San Francisco 2, California.

About Books

American Freedom and Catholic Power, by Paul Blanshard. The Beacon Press. \$3.50.

This is not an exposition of the Catholic people, but an exposition of the Catholic hierarchy. It is the lifting of an "iron curtain" around the policies and activities of a clerical group whose openly stated goal is a Catholic United States in a Catholic world.

The author lets the Catholic hierarchy speak for itself on such questions as "How the Hierarchy Works," its conceptions of "Church, State, and Democracy," "Public Schools and Public Money," "The Church and Medicine," "Sex, Birth Control, and Eugenics," "Marriage, Divorce, and Annulment," "Science, Scholarship, and Superstition," "Fascism, Communism, and Labor," "The Catholic Plan for America," "Tolerance, Appeasement, and Freedom." The chapter on "Censorship and Boycott" was well illustrated to the public when parts of this book first appeared in twelve installments in *The Nation*, ending June 4, 1948. The attack upon these articles by the Catholic hierarchy throughout the United States with the subsequent defense by distinguished Americans indicates that here is a subject that needs objective consideration.

The entire book is heavily documented, the authorities being the Catholic hierarchy themselves. The medieval philosophy and casuistry upon which the whole structure of Catholic power depends is shockingly illustrated in the section on "The Church and Medicine," where it is stated that a Catholic doctor is not allowed to destroy an undeveloped fetus in order to save the life of the mother. The mother must die for the sake of Catholic

theology. The same principle is involved in the Catholic control of science, the Catholic hierarchy claiming that all truth is divided into two grades, divine and human. "Divine truth comes from God via the Roman Catholic Church; human truth comes from finite reason, experience, and observation. Divine truth is per se infallible; human truth is always subject to correction by divine truth. If the two conflict, that conflict *ipso facto* proves that the supposed human truth is not truth at all but falsehood." Again, "the 'Catholic Almanac' defines freedom of thought as follows: 'Liberty to think the truth.'" Of course, truth comes only through the Roman Catholic Church.

This concept that the Roman Catholic Church is the only fountain of truth is the foundation of all controversies in regard to parochial schools versus public schools. If the Roman Catholic Church is the final authority in matters of truth, it logically follows that all non-Roman Catholic institutions are the sources of error. The above principle is vividly described in a pamphlet issued under the imprimatur of the late Cardinal Hayes, *May an American Oppose the Public School?* by Paul L. Blakely, S. J.

"The first duty of every Catholic father to the public school is to keep his children out of it. . . . For the man who sends his children to the public school when he could obtain for them the blessings of a Catholic education is not a practicing Catholic, even though he goes to mass every morning. . . . Is a Catholic free to attend a non-Catholic college or university? The answer is that he is not free, since the only school, whether it be a kindergarten or a university, which is fit for a Catholic, is the school that is

Catholic in its principles, its aims, its programs, its teachers, and in its submission to the direction and supervision of the Church."

Since the principle of the separation of Church and State is one of the most fundamental principles of American life, conflict with the Roman Catholic principle is inevitable. There have been, and continue to be, many attempts, large and small, open and undercover, by the Roman Catholic hierarchy to tap public funds to support Catholic schools, and to control State schools for Church purposes.

What is the Catholic plan for America? The author replies: "There is no Catholic plan for America distinct from the Catholic plan for the world. . . . The master plan is only one plan and the world-wide strategy is directed from Rome. In a Catholic world every national Government would establish the Roman Catholic Church in a unique position of privilege, and support its priests out of public revenues. That is what the Holy See has always demanded in every country where it has had the power to support the demand with reasonable strength. . . . Non-Catholic sects would probably be permitted if they were relatively quiet. . . . The Church would have sole authority over the marriage and separation of Catholics . . . complete veto power in censoring all books, magazines, newspapers, and films. The Vatican would be the chief organ of international peacemaking."

The words above are not merely the expression of wishful thinking on the part of the religious dreamers. They have become incarnate in organizations such as Catholic Action, "a lay apostolate working for a totally Catholic civilization in which the Catholic Church will be 'the mistress and guide of all other societies.'"

The excerpts in this review are samples of an extensive mass of well-documented evidence assembled by the author as information which must be plain to the people of the United States as they become

more and more a part of one world. As the author states, we must be free to choose our own futures, but the roads to representative democracy and to a Church-State lead in exactly opposite directions.

—*Archie R. Crouch.*

Report to Protestants, by Marcus Bach. The Bobbs-Merrill Company. \$3.00.

Marcus Bach writes a stimulating and at times breath-taking report of Protestants: Stimulating because it opens to the reader a reservoir of information and insight from firsthand experience on a most interesting subject. Stimulating because one always enjoys reading the lines of a first-class reporter who has the nerve to go "where angels fear to tread." Yes, and breath-taking, for it stabs American Protestantism awake to a rugged, challenging wave of cultism—a wave more diversified and potent than we have been wont to think.

Mr. Bach begins his book in a little Kansas village where he made a youthful attempt to unite the Evangelicals and the Baptists. He met the stone wall of denominationalism at its best and worst. He called denominationalism a weakening sin. The local doctor called it mitosis. The doctor won out, and Bach left Kansas deflated and sick of heart.

A bit of wandering to re-establish some roots landed the author with the Pentecostals. He vividly portrays the emotional fervor of men and women swept into the "baptism of the Holy Ghost." He himself at last spoke "with tongues," and though reticent, because of his Evangelical roots, he was "born again." In his brother's Evangelical pulpit, he preached as a true Pentecostal and was shaken deeply. But his fire did not consume their sin nor stir their complacency.

Then followed an intensive visitation of the cults from California to Boston. Mr. Bach takes his readers into services with Aimee Semple McPherson; into conversation with Father Divine; then

through experiences with palmists, psychics, clairvoyants, theosophists, self-styled spiritual technicians, and a host of others.

The reader is swept over thousands of miles and through almost every stratum of religious experience. Considerable time is spent weighing the strong programs of Christian Science, Unity, and the Oxford Fellowship.

Then Mr. Bach goes headlong into the Protestant-Roman Catholic controversy. He takes his reader at last with him to a Trappist monastery and adds Catholicism to his list of invaders of the Protestant realm of personal religion.

The author, after fifteen years, finally returns to Kansas to see the two little churches still divided by a gravel road. But he views them with the mellowed understanding that each group makes its contribution to life—even the variegated Protestants. At last he says, "The strength of the Christian faith is in the individual, and faith demands personal work."

Mr. Bach relates his *Report to Protestants* to the World Assembly of Churches at Amsterdam. And in his final plea he urges that if men unite, "let them never forget that the battle is won or lost for powerful religion in the rank and file of the people."

I would not call this a great religious book, but certainly first-rate reporting. Shot through with subtle humor, it is easy to read. Protestantism should not pass by this report.

—Jay M. Logan.

Christianity and Communism, by John C. Bennett. Association Press. \$1.50.

Mr. Bennett attributes the strength of Communism to the fact that it provides a dynamic faith for living for millions of people who have never encountered any faith which "so adequately related their social aspirations and ideals to an interpretation of the world." Christianity is the only faith whose extent, power, and in-

stitutional symbols are comparable to those of Communism. Basic issues are:

1. Christianity is based upon belief in Christ as the center of a series of historical events through which God seeks to redeem the world from error. Communism believes in the Russian Revolution as the center of a series of historical events that will lead to the redemption of the world. The Communists claim there is no God above this particular historical movement, and thus it does not admit the presence of error within it. Such a belief precludes a transcendent judgment upon society and creates a false optimism which leaves people unprepared for evil.

2. Christianity's conflict with opponents is based upon the teaching of love for the enemy and of doing good to those who do evil. The individual in every case is to be treated as the "end," never as the "means" to an end. Communism teaches that an opponent is simply an individual to be put out of the way. The individual is merely a means to an end, a pawn to be used by the State.

The conclusion suggests that military strength alone can never resolve these basic conflicts. Although military force is a factor that can never be completely avoided, the primary Christian objective is to make the pure Christian faith so true in individual lives and in society that Communism will have no grounds of injustice upon which to grow.

—Archie R. Crouch.



GOWNS

PULPIT • CHOIR
CONFIRMATION
BAPTISMAL
DOCTORS
MASTERS
BACHELORS
CAPS GOWNS AND HOODS

EST. 1912

BENTLEY & SIMON
7 WEST 36 ST • NEW YORK 18, N.Y.



Has Your Church Done Its Share?

Presbyterians must act now to bring hope to the thousands of despairing refugees who still await resettlement in Europe's dismal D. P. camps. Our denomination has agreed to be responsible for 2,000 Protestant D. P. families and to secure for them the necessary assurances of a job, a home (neither of which displaces another person), transportation from the port of arrival, and guarantee that the family will not become a public charge. All these assurances must be completed by February 1, and there is even a threatened earlier closing date in January.

Surely our great and influential Presbyterian Church will not fail in this imperative Christian responsibility! Of great institutions great things are to be expected!

Have American Christians backed the wrong side in Palestine?

Have we betrayed our obligations as Christians, and our political and economic interests as Americans, by supporting the establishment of Israel? Have we failed in our responsibility to the Arabs of Palestine—many of whom are Christians? Have we done the Jews themselves a disservice by encouraging Zionism?

Read this startling report and warning by a distinguished American churchman and archaeologist—a recognized authority on Palestine.

PALESTINE IS OUR BUSINESS

by Millar Burrows

\$2.50 at all

WESTMINSTER BOOK STORES

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The poem-prayer by Frederick J. Gillman, "God Send Us Men Whose Aim 'Twill Be," appearing on page 27, is copyrighted by the Trustees of *The Fellowship Hymn Book*.

The article entitled "Church, State, and School—a Grievous Conflict," on page 19, is used by permission of the editors of *Information Service*, published by the Department of Research and Education, Federal Council of Churches.

The article by Max Lerner on page 6 is reprinted from *Actions and Passions* by permission of Simon and Schuster, Inc., publishers. Copyright, 1949, by Max Lerner.

RESOLUTION FOR 1950

Is SOCIAL PROGRESS regularly displayed on the literature table in your church? If not, will you take appropriate steps to put it there? Make this your goal for 1950.



“Let Us Cheer the Weary Traveler”

The well-worn road to Bethlehem from a ghetto is not far,
The noise mutes angel voices; fog almost blots out the Star;
The old familiar carol, “Peace on earth, good will toward men,”
Rings no resounding echo, though we sing it once again.

The hurt and hungry longing that the heart of Mary knew;
The stable and the gift of myrrh; the love and wonder too,
Enfolding the small Jesus in the manger as he smiles,
Are here within this ghetto. . . . Come, let's trudge a few more miles!

—Geraldine Satchell Dillingham.

